

## REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-27 were pending and rejected. In this response, no claim has been canceled. Claims 1-9, 11-19, 21, 24, and 27 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

The Examiner has rejected claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention. It is respectfully submitted that claim 9 claims programming the configuration registers during the initialization period of the data processing system, where those configuration registers are normally read-only in a conventional system. After the configuration cycle in which the PCI bridge device is enabled to respond to the normal cycles (e.g., read and write cycles), these registers are configured as read-only registers compatible with the standard PCI specification regarding these types of configuration registers. Thus, claim 9 as amended is definite.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10-12, 14-18 and 20-27 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,611,912 to Maleck et al. ("Maleck"). In view of the foregoing amendments, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-27 include limitations that are not disclosed by Maleck.

Specifically, for example, independent claim 1 specifically claims a PCI bridge device having programmable ID registers that can be programmed during an initialization period of a data processing system to have a new ID different than an original ID. During a configuration cycle of the data processing system, the PCI bridge device is reported to the data processing system using the programmed new ID instead of the original ID. It is respectfully submitted

that these limitations are absent from Maleck.

Rather, although Maleck discloses a PCI riser card that can be programmed a stream of configuration data, such a riser card is not a PCI bridge device. In addition, Maleck fails to disclose the specific operations of how to program the ID registers during the initialization period and the configuration cycle as set forth in claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 is not anticipated by Maleck.

Similarly, independent claims 11, 21, and 24 include limitations similar to those recited in claim 1. Thus, for the reasons similar to those set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 11, 21, and 24 are not anticipated by Maleck. Given that the rest of the claims depend from one of the above independent claims, it is respectfully submitted that the rest of the claims are not anticipated by Maleck.

The Examiner has rejected claims 3 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Malek, in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,383,143 to Crouch et al. ("Crouch"). Claims 9 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maleck in view U.S. Patent No. 5,764,995 to DeRoo et al. ("DeRoo").

Claims 3, 9, 13, and 19 depend from one of the above independent claims. It is respectfully submitted that Crouch and/or DeRoo also fail to disclose or suggest the limitations set forth above. Therefore, claims 1-27 are patentable over the cited references. Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits the present application is now in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite or assist in the allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (408) 720-8300.

Please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any shortage of fees in connection with this response.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN

Date: January 4, 2006



Kevin G. Shao  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 45,095  
Kevin\_Shao@bstz.com

12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026  
(408) 720-8300